Estimating the error of an analog quantum simulator by additional measurements

Iris Schwenk,[1] Sebastian Zanker,[1] Jan-Michael Reiner,[1] Juha Leppäkangas,[1] and Michael Marthaler[1]

[1] *Institute of Theoretical Solid State Physics (TFP), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), 76131 Karlsruhe, Germany*

(Dated: December 13, 2016)

We study an analog quantum simulator coupled to a reservoir with a known spectral density. The reservoir perturbs the quantum simulation by causing decoherence. The simulator is used to measure an operator average, which cannot be calculated using any classical means. Since we cannot predict the result, it is difficult to estimate the effect of the environment. Especially, it is difficult to resolve whether the perturbation is small or if the actual result of the simulation is in fact very different from the ideal system we intend to study. Here, we show that in specific systems a measurement of additional correlators can be used to verify the reliability of the quantum simulation. The procedure only requires additional measurements on the quantum simulator itself. We demonstrate the method theoretically in the case of a single spin connected to a bosonic environment.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Lc,03.65.Yz

arXiv:1612.03767v1 [quant-ph] 12 Dec 2016

In recent years, there has been a tremendous progress in the development of qubits for quantum-information applications [1–4]. The number of qubits we need to build a universal error-corrected quantum computer is, however, still relatively large [5]. Therefore, it is important to develop ideas for near term applications of well-controlled quantum systems. One of the key ideas is to use small artificial quantum systems as analog quantum simulators [6]. In this case, we need to be able to map the Hamiltonian of the well-controlled artificial quantum system to a system of interest which we want to simulate [7]. This can either be achieved by rapid application of pulses or by creating a static Hamiltonian which maps to the Hamiltonian of interest, either directly or via a unitary transformation.

Many impressive experiments have been performed recently to examine models from solid-state physics using artificial quantum systems [8–11] and many additional proposals exist [12–14]. Even though the mappings are often more complicated, quantum simulation is also applicable to other fields like particle and astrophysics [15, 16]. However, to use quantum simulation as a tool to investigate problems that are not solvable analytically or on classical computers, it is essential to be able to detect errors in these systems [17–19]. Relying on validations using classical computation [20, 21] or different physical realizations [22, 23] strongly restricts the applicability of quantum simulation.

Here, we derive a protocol that allows us to estimate the size of the error in the result of the simulation by additional measurements. We consider a situation where the error arises from a coupling of the simulator to external degrees of freedom in an environmental bath. The simulator is described by the Hamiltonian $H_S(t)$ and the goal of the simulation is to determine an operator average $\langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$. We discuss a case where the simulator is coupled via the operator $\hat{O}$ to the bath described by the Hamiltonian H_B. The bath is characterized by the correlator $\langle \hat{X}(t)\hat{X}(0)\rangle_0$, where $\hat{X}$ is an operator acting on the bath. Many methods exist to determine the bath correlation function [24, 25] and we assume that the noise correlator is known. This is a simplified model which allows us to explain the major features of our approach. However, the approach also works in more general cases where many baths are coupled via many operators $\hat{O}_i$ and in situations where the perturbation is given by disorder in $H_S(t)$.

Our main result is that an estimate for the error in the simulation can be achieved by measuring additional correlators of the perturbed quantum simulator. With these additional measurements it is possible to define a perturbative quantity which needs to be small. To calculate the relevant perturbative quantity it is necessary to measure correlators of the form $\langle \hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle$. Here, we show under which condition the result of the quantum simulation is reliable. To derive this condition we use an expansion in the coupling on Keldysh contour [26] and discuss the conditions of convergence.

The full system can be described by the Hamiltonian

$$H(t) = H_S(t) + H_B + H_C\,, \tag{1}$$

where H_C describes the coupling between the ideal simulator contained in $H_S(t)$ and the bath contained in H_B. The time evolution of the full system is given by

$$U(t,t_0) = \mathcal{T}\exp\left(-i\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t'\, H(t')\right)\,, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the time-ordering operator ($t > t_0$). The evolution without coupling to the environment, which we call the ideal time evolution, is described by

$$U_0(t,t_0) = \mathcal{T}\exp\left(-i\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t'\, H_0(t')\right)\,, \tag{3}$$

with $H_0(t) = H_S(t) + H_B$. We transform operators in the interaction picture according to,

$\hat{B}_I(t) = U_0(t_0,t)\hat{B}U_0(t,t_0)$. With this we calculate the expectation value of operator $\hat{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_0 U(t_0,t)\hat{A}U(t,t_0)\right] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_0 U_I(t_0,t)\hat{A}_I(t)U_I(t,t_0)\right] , \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with $U_I(t,t_0) = \mathcal{T}\exp\left(-i\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t'\, H_{C,I}(t')\right)$. We expand $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle$ in orders of H_C. In the zeroth order we have $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle \approx \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_0\hat{A}_I(t)\right]$, which is the ideal result. To show the expansion in a compact fashion we use the graphical form of an expansion on Keldysh contour [26]. In this case an expansion in H_C results in

$\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle =$  (5)

Here, each upper line corresponds to the free (ideal) forward time evolution, Eq. (3), and the lower line to the backward time evolution. The dots represent orders of H_C and we consider explicit time sorting. All diagrams up to the fourth order are shown. We assume $\langle H_C\rangle = 0$ and that contributions from odd orders in H_C are zero. Explicitly, the contributions up to second order are

$$\langle A(t)\rangle \approx \mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_0\hat{A}_I(t)\right] + \int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\mathrm{d}t_2\, C_2(t,t_1,t_2)\,, \tag{6}$$

with the zeroth-order term $\mathrm{Tr}\left[\rho_0\hat{A}_I(t)\right] = \langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$, where the index 0 indicates that the time evolution is taken with $H_C = 0$. If we assume the coupling Hamiltonian to be $H_C = \hat{O}\hat{X}$, the lowest-order correction $C_2(t,t_1,t_2)$ can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} C_2(t,t_1,t_2) = &\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0\langle\hat{X}(t_1)\hat{X}(t_2)\rangle_0 \\ &+\langle\hat{O}(t_2)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_1)\rangle_0\langle\hat{X}(t_2)\hat{X}(t_1)\rangle_0 \\ &+\langle\hat{O}(t_2)\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0\langle\hat{X}(t_2)\hat{X}(t_1)\rangle_0 \\ &+\langle\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0\langle\hat{X}(t_1)\hat{X}(t_2)\rangle_0 . \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

If the expansion converges, C_2 is an estimate for the size of the error introduced by the environment. This is discussed in more detail at the end of this article. To be able to estimate C_2, the approximate size and form of the noise correlator $\langle\hat{X}(t_1)\hat{X}(t_2)\rangle_0$ needs to be known. We assume that the noise correlator can be estimated either by theoretical considerations or through calibration techniques.

We now propose the following protocol to estimate the deviation of the measurement result $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle$ from the ideal result $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$:

1. The average $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle$ and the three-time correlators of the form $\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle$ which appear in Eq. (7) have to be measured. Of course, when measured, these quantities are perturbed averages with $H_C \neq 0$.

2. We assume the perturbation to be small, an assumption which we will control in a self consistent way. From our initial assumption we can then assume that $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle \approx \langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$. In the same way we assume for all relevant three-time correlators that $\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle \approx \langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0$ and so on for the other correlators.

3. In accordance with our assumption in point 2, we use the measured three-time correlators to calculate C_2. If all our assumptions are valid, the correction is small in comparison to the result of the simulation $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle$ and we have a relation of the form

$$\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\mathrm{d}t_2\, C_2(t,t_1,t_2) \ll \langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle\ . \tag{8}$$

If Eq. (8) holds for the C_2 calculated from the measurement results, this means that the determination of C_2 was approximately correct and that the results of the quantum simulator are reliable. In the case that Eq. (8) does not hold, both our estimate for C_2 and for $\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$ are not reliable and within our method no result can be gained from the simulator.

In the following, we establish the properties of the system that lead to a converging expansion in H_C, such that C_2 can in fact remain small. It is immediately clear that our expansion corresponds to a short-term expansion of the time evolution. Therefore we show that for generic three-time correlators $\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0$, our expansion tends to diverge in the limit of long times. However, we find that for some specific but still quite general forms of the three-time correlators, convergence can be achieved even in the long time limit and therefore the error in a quantum simulation might stay small on all time scales. After this, we verify for the case of a single qubit that the protocol described above is in fact able to characterize the reliability of the result of the perturbed simulation. In the following, we call the three-time correlators $\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0$ "system correlators" since they only involve operators acting on the system.

To analyze the convergence of the series in Eq. (5), we first approximate the bath correlator as an exponentially

decaying function,

$$\langle \hat{X}(t_1)\hat{X}(t_2)\rangle_0 \approx \lambda e^{-\gamma|t_1-t_2|}\,. \tag{9}$$

For any situation where the effect of the bath should stay small, this is a necessary assumption. It is also in accordance with the standard master-equation approach used to describe decoherence in quantum systems. In a more general treatment, the bath correlator is given by a sum of exponential functions. In our approximation, we only keep the function with the smallest decay rate γ which contributes at long time scales.

At first, we consider the worst case scenario, where the system correlators neither decay nor oscillate fast. Here, we treat them as a constant factor c_1 when evaluating the integrals. With this we find,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\mathrm{d}t_2\,\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0\,\langle X(t_1)X(t_2)\rangle_0\\ &= c_1\lambda\frac{t-t_0}{\gamma}+c_1\lambda\frac{e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}-1}{\gamma^2}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

For each of the four terms in Eq. (7) we find the same result with an appropriate constant c_i. These terms increase with increasing time. It is illustrative to consider a term of the fourth order. Here, we contract the bath correlators in the following form

 (11)

To write it in this way we assumed that Wick's theorem holds for the operators $\hat{X}$, so that the bath correlator is given by a product of two-time correlators. From standard master-equation calculations, we find that inseparable diagrams (the last two diagrams) will converge quite well if the bath correlator decays fast. For our specific calculation this means that inseparable diagrams will never be larger then the lowest-order contribution. However, the first diagram is separable and therefore not converging for $t_0 \to -\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}&=\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\mathrm{d}t_2\int_{t_0}^{t_2}\mathrm{d}t_3\int_{t_0}^{t_3}\mathrm{d}t_4\langle\hat{X}(t_1)X(t_2)\rangle_0\langle\hat{X}(t_3)X(t_4)\rangle_0\\ &\times\langle\hat{O}(t_3)\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\hat{O}(t_4)\rangle_0 \approx c\lambda^2\frac{(t-t_0)^2}{\gamma^2}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We see that some of the fourth-order contributions grow quadratically with time and similar results can be found for higher-order diagrams. To achieve convergence in this series at long times, it is necessary that the correlators of the system operators decay exponentially.

We now demonstrate the convergence in a simple example, where H_S is a simulator for the spin-boson model, a situation which is similar to several proposals for quantum simulators consisting of qubits coupled to bosonic baths [27, 28]. We consider a regime where all properties of the model can be calculated within the Born-Markov approximation [29]. This, of course, is not a very interesting limit for quantum simulation, but it allows us to straightforwardly discuss the properties of the correction C_2, Eq. (7), for the case where the system correlators decay exponentially to the stationary value. The system we consider is described by

$$H_S = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\sigma_z + \sum_i \omega_i b_i^\dagger b_i + \sigma_x\sum_i t_i(b_i^\dagger + b_i) \tag{13}$$

$$H_B = \sum_i \epsilon_i c_i^\dagger c_i \tag{14}$$

$$H_C = \sigma_x\sum_i f_i(c_i^\dagger + c_i)\,. \tag{15}$$

We have then $\hat{O}=\sigma_x$. Experimentally this could correspond to a situation where a simulator of the spin-boson model is coupled to another independent bosonic bath. This offset to the ideal system can be described by the perturbation H_B coupled to the system via H_C. For simplicity, we assume now that the bath H_B has approximately a flat spectral density, so that we can use the simple approximation in Eq. (9) for the bath correlator (similar exponential decay also characterizes more general environments in the long time limit). Additionally, we assume the variation of the system correlators $\langle\hat{O}(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t_2)\rangle_0$ on the scale γ^{-1} to be negligible and therefore in the limit $t_0\to-\infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\int_{t_0}^{t_1}\mathrm{d}t_2\,C_2(t,t_1,t_2)\\ \approx&\frac{2\lambda}{\gamma}\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\left(\langle\sigma_x(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\sigma_x(t_1)\rangle_0-\langle\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0\right)\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{aligned}=&\frac{2\lambda}{\gamma}\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}t_1\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi^0_{t_1\to t}(\sigma_x\Pi^0_{t_0\to t_1}(\rho_0)\sigma_x)\hat{A}\right]\\ &-\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Pi^0_{t_0\to t}(\rho_0)\hat{A}\right]\Big)\,,\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\Pi^0_{t_1\to t_2}(\rho)$ describes the time evolution of the system density matrix according to H_0. To derive this have we used the quantum regression theorem and that $\sigma_x^2=\mathbb{1}$. Master-equation calculations yield the time evolution of the density matrix of the spin-boson model,

$$\Pi^0_{t_0\to t}(\rho)=\begin{pmatrix}e^{-\Gamma(t-t_0)}\rho^0_{\uparrow\uparrow} & e^{-\frac{i\epsilon+\Gamma}{2}(t-t_0)}\rho^0_{\uparrow\downarrow}\\ e^{\frac{i\epsilon-\Gamma}{2}(t-t_0)}\rho^0_{\downarrow\uparrow} & 1-e^{-\Gamma(t-t_0)}\rho^0_{\uparrow\uparrow}\end{pmatrix}\,, \tag{18}$$

with the spin decay rate Γ, and ρ^0 being the initial density matrix at t_0. Preparing the system in a mixed state,

$$\rho_0=\begin{pmatrix}a & 0\\ 0 & 1-a\end{pmatrix}\,, \tag{19}$$

we find in the limit $t_0 \to -\infty$

$$\Pi^0_{t_1\to t}(\sigma_x \Pi^0_{t_0\to t_1}(\rho_0)\sigma_x) - \Pi^0_{t_0\to t}(\rho_0) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-\Gamma(t-t_1)} & 0 \\ 0 & -e^{-\Gamma(t-t_1)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{20}$$

and with this

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2\, C_2(t,t_1,t_2) \propto \frac{\lambda}{\gamma\Gamma}\,. \tag{21}$$

We find a finite value for the second-order term even on long time scales. With this we see that the system correlators have the ability to create convergence in the series in Eq. (5). On the condition that the series converges, a measurement of C_2 reveals the reliability of the quantum simulation. In the above situation, the result is then proportional to the ratio of the decoherence rates induced by the two parts of the bosonic environment, λ/γ and Γ, as expected. In the Supplementary Information, we go through another example where C_2 correctly predicts the induced error.

To study the question whether a small value of C_2 justifies the assumption that the series converges, we use the fact that the main contributions for $t_0 \to -\infty$ arise from separable diagrams. For convergence, it is necessary that the system correlators decay. For a simple example we assume them to decay exponentially like $e^{-\kappa(t-t_i)}$. With this we find in the second order (similar to above)

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2 C_2(t,t_1,t_2) \approx \frac{\lambda}{\gamma\kappa} \Big(2\,\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 - \langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0 - \langle \hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \Big)\,. \tag{22}$$

In the fourth order, we get the contributions

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2 \int_{t_0}^{t_2} \mathrm{d}t_3 \int_{t_0}^{t_3} \mathrm{d}t_4 C_4(t,t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4) \\ &\approx \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma\kappa}\right)^2 \Big(\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0 \\ &\quad - 4\,\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \\ &\quad + 6\,\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \\ &\quad - 4\,\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \\ &\quad + \langle \hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \Big)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In the specific case $\hat{O} = \sigma_x$ and $\hat{A} = \sigma_z$, we obtain in second order that $\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2 C_2(t,t_1,t_2) \approx -4\frac{\lambda}{\gamma\kappa} \langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_0$, and in fourth order that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2 \int_{t_0}^{t_2} \mathrm{d}t_3 \int_{t_0}^{t_3} \mathrm{d}t_4 C_4(t,t_1,t_2,t_3,t_4) &\approx 16 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\gamma\kappa}\right)^2 \langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_0 \\ &\approx \left(\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2 C_2(t,t_1,t_2) \right)^2 \langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_0^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

We see that if $C_2/\langle A(t)\rangle_0 = x$ then $C_4/\langle A(t)\rangle_0 \approx x^2$. Therefore, in this example, a small value of C_2 indicates the convergence of the series in H_C.

The approximations discussed above can be used to simplify the condition given in Eq. (8). The limit $t_0 \to -\infty$ means that the time interval between preparation of the initial state of the emulator at t_0 and the measurement of operator $\hat{A}$ at time t is large in comparison to the decay times of system and bath κ^{-1}, γ^{-1}. In this limit, we obtain a simple relation for the self consistent verification of the result $\langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle$ of the quantum simulator,

$$\frac{\lambda}{\gamma\kappa} \Big(2\,\langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 - \langle \hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{A}(t)\rangle_0 - \langle \hat{A}(t)\hat{O}(t)\hat{O}(t)\rangle_0 \Big) \ll \langle \hat{A}(t)\rangle_0\,. \tag{25}$$

Here, an estimation of κ, λ and γ and a measurement of the three correlators is enough to verify the reliability of the quantum simulation for $\langle A(t)\rangle_0$.

It is also possible that the quantum simulator is not coupled to its environment through one operator $\hat{O}$, but rather that multiple independent baths are coupled via $H_C = \sum_i \hat{O}_i \hat{X}_i$. The calculations presented above can be straightforwardly extended to this case, where sums over $\langle \hat{O}_i(t_1)\hat{A}(t)\hat{O}_j(t_2)\rangle_0$ appear.

Furthermore, errors in quantum simulation can arise from imperfections in the fabrication, which can be interpreted as disorder. In this case, the perturbed quantum simulator is described by $H = H_S + \delta H_S$. An expansion in δH_S under an ensemble average results in the same equations if the disorder has a Gaussian distribution. In the case discussed explicitly in this article, the bath correlators create convergence for non-separable diagrams, but in the case of disorder, convergence is critical since it only emerges from the system correlators.

Finally, in the considered situations a small value of C_2 indicated negligible higher-order contributions and thereby justified the verification method. This is not true in all generality. Of course, in certain systems it might be possible that C_4 is finite even though C_2 vanishes. At the same time this would indicate that the perturbation theory fails as a whole. The protocol can also be applied to a set of operators $\hat{A}_i$, rather than one, to increase the reliability. For non-ideal situations beyond these scenarios, further error tests can be considered by extending the above protocol to higher orders in H_C. The risk of

not detecting errors should then be carefully analyzed for each realization of the quantum simulator separately.

In conclusion, we showed how the measurement of additional correlators can be used to study the reliability of a quantum simulation of a certain expectation value $\langle \hat{A}(t) \rangle$ in a self-consistent manner. The procedure is able to estimate the size of the error by using only measurable quantities of the quantum simulator, if the bath spectral density is known and if the ideal system correlators decay towards a stationary average. This type of approach can then be used to test the reliability of the result of an analog quantum simulation without comparing to classical computations or to other physical realizations of the quantum simulator. Our method supports the development of near term quantum simulators that are used to solve problems which cannot be solved or verified using classical computers.

We thank Gerd Schön for fruitful discussions. Iris Schwenk acknowledges financial support by Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

[1] H. Häffner, C.F. Roos, and R. Blatt, Phys. Rep. **469**, 155 (2008).
[2] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker, and K. Mølmer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2313 (2010).
[3] R. Blatt, and C. F. Roos, Nat. Phys. **8**, 277 (2012).
[4] R. Barends, J. Kelly, A. Megrant, A. Veitia, D. Sank, E. Jeffrey, T. C. White, J. Mutus, A. G. Fowler, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, C. Neill, P. O'Malley, P. Roushan, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, A. N. Korotkov, A. N. Cleland, and John M. Martinis, Nature **508**, 500 (2014).
[5] A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 032324 (2012).
[6] E. Manousakis, J. Low Temp. Phys. **126**, 1501 (2002).
[7] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 153 (2014).
[8] J. G. Bohnet, B. C. Sawyer, J. W. Britton, M. L. Wall, A. M. Rey, M. Foss-Feig, and J. J. Bollinger, Science **352**, 6291 (2016).
[9] J. Struck, C. Olschläger, R. Le Targat, P. Soltan-Panahi, A. Eckardt, M. Lewenstein, P. Windpassinger, and K. Sengstock, Science **333**, 996 (2011).
[10] K. M. O'Hara, S. L. Hemmer, M. E. Gehm, S. R. Granade, and J. E. Thomas, Science **298**, 2179 (2002).
[11] R. Hart, P. Duarte, T. Yang, X. Liu, T. Paiva, E. Khatami, R. T. Scalettar, N. Trivedi, D. A. Huse, and R. G. Hulet, Nature (London) **519**, 211 (2015).
[12] J.-M. Reiner, M. Marthaler, J. Braumüller, M. Weides, and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032338 (2016).
[13] F. Mei, V. M. Stojanovic, I. Siddiqi, and L. Tian, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 224502 (2013).
[14] J. Cai, I. Cohen, A. Retzker, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 160504 (2015).
[15] T. E. Lee, U. Alvarez-Rodriguez, X.-H. Cheng, L. Lamata, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 032129 (2015).
[16] J. Steinhauer, Nat. Phys. **12**, 959 (2016).
[17] P. Hauke, F. M. Cucchietti, L. Tagliacozzo, I. Deutsch, and M. Lewenstein, Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 082401 (2012).
[18] M. Sarovar, J. Zhang, L. Zeng, arXiv:1603.09283.
[19] D. Hangleiter, M. Kliesch, M. Schwarz, J. Eisert, arXiv:1602.00703.
[20] S. Trotzky, L. Pollet, F. Gerbier, U. Schnorrberger, I. Bloch, N. V. Prokof'ev, B. Svistunov, and M. Troyer, Nat. Phys. **6**, 998 (2010).
[21] R. Jordens, L. Tarruell, D. Greif, T. Uehlinger, N. Strohmaier, H. Moritz, T. Esslinger, L. De Leo, C. Kollath, A. Georges, V. Scarola, L. Pollet, E. Burovski, E. Kozik, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 180401 (2010).
[22] D. Leibfried, Nature (London) **463**, 608 (2010).
[23] T. H. Johnson, S. R. Clark, and D. Jaksch, EPJ Quantum Technology **1**, 10 (2014).
[24] J. Bylander, S. Gustavsson, F. Yan, F. Yoshihara, K. Harrabi, G. Fitch, D. G. Cory, Y. Nakamura, J.-S. Tsai and W. D. Oliver Nat. Phys. **7**, 565 (2011).
[25] M. P. V. Stenberg and F. K. Wilhelm Phys. Rev. A 94, 052119 (2016).
[26] H. Schoeller and G. Schön, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 18436 (1994).
[27] L. Garcia-Alvarez, U. Las Heras, A. Mezzacapo, M. Sanz, E. Solano, and L. Lamata Scientific Reports **6**, 27836 (2016).
[28] S. Mostame, P. Rebentrost, A. Eisfeld, A. J. Kerman, D. I. Tsomokos, A. Aspuru-Guzik New J. Phys. **14**, 105013 (2012).
[29] U. Weiss, "Quantum Dissipative Systems", 3rd ed., World Scientific, 2008.

Supplementary Information

In this supplementary part, we show that for a system Hamiltonian that describes a decoherence-free single spin, and a bath Hamiltonian that induces system decoherence, the check of the condition in Eq. (8) results in the conclusion that the quantum simulation ist not reliable. With this we have then given examples to show that our protocol works in confirming a reliable quantum simulation. But as well we showed that the protocol is able to reveal the fact that perturbations are too strong to trust the results. The case of a single qubit is not of interest for real quantum simulations, but due to the fact that the system correlators do not decay without influence of the external degrees of freedom, it is a simple example to illustrate the rejection by our protocol.

We consider the case, where

$$H_S = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\sigma_z \qquad H_B = \sum_i \epsilon_i c_i^\dagger c_i \qquad H_C = \sigma_x \sum_i f_i(c_i^\dagger + c_i)\,. \tag{26}$$

The system Hamiltonian is thereby decoherence free. In our protocol, C_2 is calculated (measured) using the perturbed correlators, since we assume self-consistently that they are equivalent (or very close) to the unperturbed correlators. To show that our protocol works, we have to verify the condition in Eq. (8) using the perturbed quantities.

Since the perturbed system is equivalent to the unperturbed spin-boson model discussed in the paper, we can give the result directly,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2\, C_2(t, t_1, t_2) \propto \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{\tilde{\gamma}\tilde{\Gamma}}\,, \tag{27}$$

where we assume the limit $t_0 \to -\infty$ and used the initial mixed state in Eq. (19). The bath that induces the transition of the qubit with rate $\tilde{\Gamma}$, is in this case the same that characterizes the external bath, so that we have $\tilde{\Gamma} \approx \frac{\tilde{\lambda}}{\tilde{\gamma}}$. Within this identification we get

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}t_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathrm{d}t_2\, C_2(t, t_1, t_2) \approx 2(A_{22} - A_{11})\,, \tag{28}$$

where A_{11}, A_{22} are matrix elements of $\hat{A}$. In the limit $t_0 \to -\infty$, the condition implied by the relation of Eq. (8) then reduces to

$$2|A_{22} - A_{11}| \ll |A_{22}|\,. \tag{29}$$

In the case $A_{11} = -A_{22}$, the condition is never fulfilled. Therefore, the protocol reveals that the result of the simulation is not reliable. We also see that applying our protocol to different operators $\hat{A}$ erases the possible mistake arising from that the reliability condition is fulfilled "by accident"(i.e. when $A_{11} \approx A_{22}$).